

### Remarks

Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments made in the Office Action Response filed on April 7, 2004, comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b). The April 7<sup>th</sup> Response included a reply to each argument set forth in the Office Action dated January 8, 2004, and did not include any amendments to the claims. Thus, the assertion that the April 7<sup>th</sup> Response is non-responsive due to a misnumbering of claims is incorrect as no claims were listed in the April 7<sup>th</sup> Response.

With respect to the erroneous dependency of claims 14-16, these claims were first presented in the Office Action Response and Amendment filed on September 21, 2001. The Office Action dated December 20, 2001, at paragraph 2, acknowledged this issue but made no objection. In order to correct this issue formally, Applicant has herein amended claims 14, 15 and 16 to depend from claims 13, 1, and 15, respectively. With respect to the dependency of claim 13, Applicant submits that claim 13 properly depends from system claim 1 and not claim 8 which is a method claim. Claims 14-16 also now correctly depend from system claim 1.

Applicant submits that the April 7<sup>th</sup> Response complied fully with 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b) and the amendments herein address the previously existing dependency issues of claims 14-16.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (651) 686-6633.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
St. Paul, MN 55120  
651/686-6633

By: 

Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No. 32,122

Dated: July 26, 2004